DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 585 EA 030 933

AUTHOR Bogotch, Ira E.
TITLE Educational Leadership and Social Justice: Theory into Practice.
PUB DATE 2000-11-00
NOTE 14p.; Earlier version of paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA) (Albuquerque, NM).
PUB TYPE Opinion Papers (120) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Effectiveness; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Justice; *Leadership Styles; Political Issues; Postmodernism; *School Community Relationship; *Social Attitudes; *Social Environment; Social Problems; Social Structure; *Social Theories; Social Values; *Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Dewey (John)

ABSTRACT

Connecting theory and practice to the moral use of power reveals why social justice, as an educational intervention, is relevant in every era. Social justice requires ongoing struggle and cannot be separated from the educational theories and practices of professionals, schools, academic disciplines, and governmental agents. Insights from John Dewey illuminate the importance of creating an educational community with multiple perspectives on social justice, in contrast to the quasi-heroic discourse of strong leaders with vision. Contemporary efforts to apply Dewey in education demonstrate the need to incorporate many differing constituencies and visions of social justice. Individualist perceptions of justice stand in contrast to this pluralistic perspective, placing the emergence of justice on the shoulders of risk-taking visionaries, whether as educational reformers or revolutionaries. Dewey's social reconstructivist vision focused on building social justice today, in the practical tasks of daily life, rather than in the future. This orientation resonates with the postmodern turn in academia that strives for justice through critique, example, and practice, instead of elaborate proofs of truth in pursuit of future justice. Social justice has many meanings, presenting leaders with the ongoing challenge of creating social and political spaces for advocates and outlaws, both in and out of schools, to explore and make explicit the connections between subjective meanings of social justice. As a continuous social construct, educational leadership cannot be one design, one program, or one view, to the exclusion of other approaches. (Contains 12 references.) (TEJ)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 452 585

Educational Leadership and Social Justice: Theory into Practice[1]

Ira E. Bogotch
Florida Atlantic University

Introduction:

Regardless of what I say, write, or do, I will always be too theoretical or too practical depending upon whom I'm interacting with at any one particular moment in time. If this is true, then to some indeterminate degree, we are all theoretical and practical. How then should we try to distinguish the two constructs without relying upon a fixed point of reference or assuming some arbitrary and artificial definition of the meaning of theory or practice? In everyday terms, the theory-practice distinction doesn't have any one fixed meaning. Can the same be said for meanings of social justice?

Only recently have such questions been raised by professors of educational leadership.[2] How then should we frame the question: exploring the theory- practice interface within the context of social justice? In broad philosophical terms, this question has been debated for over two thousand years. Not even the phrase "context of social justice" is new. Plato believed that slotting individuals through education into their natural positions in society was just. Thus, we have the kind of continuing topic in which yesterday's, today's and tomorrow's answers will not be the final word – ever. I would, therefore, suggest that we rephrase the question to read "why the question of theory and practice with respect to social justice needs to be asked and answered repeatedly?"

My intention in this essay is to present two different educational leadership responses to the question of theory-practice interface with social justice in order to re-affirm the above position that there are no permanent or universal meanings to any of the constructs under discussion. This relativity does not mean that we can't or shouldn't have this discussion or that any discussion is pointless just because there may be other positions to emerge which are just as valid. That's not the case at all. There are always consequences to ideas and actions. In other words, whenever educators act on their passionate beliefs, it can and does make a difference. We need to have these discussions inside of educational leadership in order to deliberately and continually refocus our work [in theory and practice] in education on becoming as socially just as we can.

I have begun with Dewey's social construction of theory and practice as a point of departure for social justice actions. I have to say upfront that when faced with an intellectual challenge, I often return to Dewey for insight and inspiration. His refusal to provide me or anyone else with explicit criteria or definitive answers has been so much more reassuring than all the classification schemes, taxonomies, and models found throughout the academic literature in educational leadership. On this very point, I have not been influenced a bit by Dewey's critics, regardless of how they may claim themselves to be using his ideas only to then violate his basic social reconstructivist processes. What is appealing to me is that Dewey deliberately does not try to say everything and everything. He is not complete. And that's the point. It may be correct to call him naive, uncritical, too trusting in scientific inquiry, etc., but the educational leadership response need not

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
I Bogotch
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 030933

abandon the social reconstructive processes in order to stake a claim on a definitive set of criteria. That's too easy and his point. Education [theory or practice] cannot predict or control outcomes [as hoped for by Halpin, (1966) and others during the Theory movement of educational leadership]. Socially and constructively, perhaps the best educational leadership can do is insist that we create and support forums for all voices to be heard. Yes, the notion of social justice cannot be assumed simply by having open social processes as if social justice were an innate need [or direction toward progress] of all people. Social justice, just like education, is a deliberate intervention that requires the moral use of power. For that reason, we must challenge structures built upon the so-called neutrality of objective reality and acknowledge that the systems we have in place represent and, subsequently, reproduce the dominant culture and values in society (Bourdieux & Passeron, 1977/96 ; Foster, 1986).

Thus, when we connect theory and practice to the moral use of power, we can better understand why social justice -- as an educational intervention – is a continuously relevant topic for every era. Social justice requires an ongoing struggle [i.e., to share power/knowledge/resources equitably] and cannot be separated from how educational theories and practices are being [re]defined and practiced by professionals within schools, academic disciplines and governmental circles. From a social justice perspective, it is essential to make these connections transparent and tangible.

After the section on Dewey, I describe how one exemplary school leader put Dewey's ideas into practice. Here, the educational leadership challenge resulted in [re]creating an educational community with multiple perspectives of justice. This view of educational leadership is very different from the quasi-heroic discourse of strong school leaders with vision. Another path toward social justice takes off from an individualistic perspective wherein social justice is viewed as an ideal process or end. I then turn toward two consequences: the integration of social justice into schools – as a kind of postprogressive model of social justice (Pignatelli, 1993); and, a transgression not only of school boundaries, but those of society as well. My primary purpose is not to lead the reader to choose or conclude that one particular view of the social justice interface with theory and practice is superior to any other, but rather to acknowledge that educational leadership must continuously confront the issue of social justice in all its guises and to deliberately make social justice a central part of educational leadership discourse and actions while, at the same time, vigilantly critique such actions and motives such that when the material conditions change, we have to start all over again.

Dewey's Theory and Practice Relationship

Dewey's 1904 essay titled "The relation of theory and practice in education" (pp. 9-30) distinguished between two kinds of school practice: one based primarily on improving craft knowledge and becoming a competent practitioner; the other based primarily upon intellect. The first was labeled apprentice practice where the aim is to become technically proficient. It's largely a mechanical process, through imitating the expert or mentor. Energy and focus goes into performing an action as closely to how it has been described and/or demonstrated previously. The

end product should be almost identical to the demonstrated model, thus, through apprentice or craft knowledge, current practice is replicated, and the *status quo* is almost always maintained.

In the second definition, Dewey describes laboratory practice. This is a more intellectual activity than apprentice practice. Whereas experience alone, especially for the beginning practitioner, presents immediate input requiring a quick response often based on mechanically following the advice of experienced practitioners, laboratory practice holds out the possibility – it's only a possibility – for understanding of the whys and hows behind doing the activities, and, consequently, for improving performance and making real changes. Laboratory practice potentially has the power to construct new knowledge and new practices. Although these two kinds of practice are fundamentally different, they are not mutually exclusive in that whichever kind of practice one is doing, you can't help but learn something of the other. Nevertheless, without intellectual activities, the practitioner gives lip service only to lofty ideals [e.g., all children can learn, social justice] in theory while basing actual practice on continuing habits and experiences.

Regarding the nature and aim of theory, Dewey begins with an assumption that every student [and teacher] brings human capital based on experiences gained from life. It is the responsibility of the teacher to utilize those lived experiences as examples which can make practical the theories being introduced. By valuing the practical experiences of students, Dewey sees no justification for separating classroom experiences and learning from practical experiences and learning. How did schools and classroom get separated from life? That is, of course, Dewey's fundamental question regarding theory, practice, and social justice.

Thus, Dewey holds to distinctions between theory [as a social reconconstructivist philosophy] and practice [as immediate experience and intellectual activity]; but, he does not lose sight of connecting his theory and practice to larger social reform dynamics. It is not just thoughtful practitioners that Dewey hopes educators will become, but also men and women with the capabilities to critique programs and policies that are continuously foisted upon schools. Ultimately he believes that self-control, self-directed activities, and intellectual and moral growth must define educational actions – as they do in other professions and aspects of social life. He attributes so many of the problems he saw in schools to this lack of intellectual vitality and moral growth on the part of teachers and principals:

> "The tendency of educational development to proceed by reaction from one thing to another, to adopt for one year, or for a term of seven years, this or that new study or methods of teaching, and then as abruptly to swing over to some new educational gospel, is a result which would be impossible if teachers were adequately moved by their own independent intelligence. The willingness of teachers, especially of those occupying administrative positions, to become submerged in the routine detail of their callings , to expend the build of their energy upon forms and rules and regulations and reports and percentages, is another evidence of the absence of intellectual vitality. If teachers were possessed by the spirit of an abiding student of education, this spirit would find some way

> of breaking through the mesh and coil of circumstance and would find expression for itself" (p. 16).

The question is whether Dewey's social reconstructivist epistemology is valid and sufficient with respect to educational leadership and social justice. Obviously, educational practice has decided that it is neither valid nor sufficient. Why?

Dewey's Disciplines: Social Justice in Practice

What is so remarkable about good theory, such as Dewey's, is that others can take them directly into practice so that we can see concrete results. Angelo Patri, was a New York City public school principal from 1908 to 1944. While studying at both CCNY and Teachers College, he found that "[t]hey were all so far away, so ineffectual, so dead. I was disheartened" (p. 14). Yet within the university setting, he ultimately found two "Educational Leaders...." He wrote, "I came upon the thing I needed. This was a course with Dr. McMurry[3] and the text-book used as a basis of discussion, was Dewey's Essay on `Ethical Principles'" (p. 14).

McMurry and colleagues at Teachers College distinguished between two different school practices, those typical of day schools and those typical of adult settlement schools. In the Third NSSSE Yearbook , which published Dewey's essay on theory and practice, McMurry et al. described the Speyer School -- a school supported and controlled by Teachers College for undergraduate and graduate studies and experimentation. Although the TC faculty viewed the operations of the Speyer School as really two schools, each "seriously defective" (p. 57), McMurry et al. hoped to combine them: "As time passes an attempt will be made to modify this neighborhood work radically, and to bring it and the day school together.... Anyone must admit that even the so-called good school of the present is a thoroughly theoretical institution, imparting a large amount of theory about how to live and exciting a good degree of interest, but not following up either to the point of use or practice" (p. 57).[4]

We get a clearer picture of this model in practice from the writings of Patri himself. I want to point out first, however, that during this era, there was a nationwide movement called social centers, civic activity centers appended to public schools. The movement was publicly supported by the administrations of T. Roosevelt, Taft, and Wilson. By 1913, seventy-one cities had established social centers (Steven, 1972); in each city, the model and purpose was different. From Stevens' history, we view social centers as a progressive liberal policy meant to promote social control and Americanization rather than a vehicle to promote serious political debate and untidy notions of social justice. Because at this time I do not see any direct connection between Patri's neighborhood school efforts and those of the national social center movement – other than a faith in progressive ideas, I will let Patri's own words speak for themselves before commenting on the notion of social justice in practice. He wrote:

> "I asked the people to stop [by]. They had stopped. By ones and twos they had come through the gates. Then we had gone on together, parents and teachers, sharing the

children's problems. We had worked individually and collectively to push the school out into the neighbourhood. `My school' had become `Our School.' The teachers' school had become the people's school.

"Through efforts to get the people as the background for the spiritual growth of the children the school had succeeded in starting the mass movement. And then what happened? The energy of the mass had begun to divide itself almost at the very moment of its greatest unity. Each group had begun to interpret the idea of service in terms of its own experience. Each had begun to think, `Mine is the most important work.'"

Patri goes on to describe the different foci of the groups – some were committed to health, others to improving the physical facilities, others to settlement aid, and still others focused on civic duty. In each instance, the participants believed their work to be "the most important." Thus, it fell to the principal, Angelo Patri, to accommodate this multiplicity of activities within the school. Once established, however, he wrote:

"We had thought our worries were over, and they were only beginning in a new way. I realised that the problem the school was now facing was one common to many schools. There was scarcely a congested school district in the city that had not its settlement, its library, its hospital, its park, its charitable organizations, its civic bodies. Would the school be equal to the task of keeping the social forces working together, the children always as the centre of united effort?

"*There was no answer* (my italics). And yet I knew that the school must accept the challenge or again stand alone while the crowd passed by its gates. The school that had started the mass movement and had watched it take its course would now have to regather the mass and start it off once more (p. 153).

Like many of us, Patri stayed in education long enough to see how education works in practice. Literally, thirty-five pages and six years later, Patri took stock of the school again. He wrote, alas, "there was no spot where the child in the regular grades could turn for freedom" (pp. 187-188). The city's population had grown such that his school which "held a little more than two thousand children had grown again to almost four thousand" (p. 187). What exactly happened? The community-based reforms that existed just six years earlier had disappeared. The neighborhood and its demographics changed creating a school environment totally different from what had been before. One can assume that it would take another community reform effort on the part of the principal to create a new kind of social and educational dynamics to make this "new" school work. Patri was the educational leader, but the dynamics leading to social justice were based on creating and recreating [multiple] school communities. In this instance, the theory and practice interface with social justice emerges as follows: given the social reconstructive view of knowledge, meanings are fluid based on the practical experiences of the participants. The educational leader of a school needs to create an environment which permits the practice of a variety of social justice programs. But just as soon as the conditions are right for this confluence,

different conditions emerge [demographically, contextually, etc.] necessitating actions which attempt to both hold the center [i.e., the common core leadership values] together and adjust the practices to the changing conditions. Thus, the meanings of social justice emerge without prediction, control, or permanence.

Patri through McMurry and Dewey had the vision and extended the public an invitation; but as soon as others joined with him, the conceptions of a good school changed to incorporate the many different constituencies, all with other visions of social justice. The best Patri could do was support the many different efforts of educational reform and community that were happening concurrently. But as soon as the construction began to take shape as a good school, so began the destruction. Social justice would then have to be reconstructed again and again.

Social Justice from an Individual Perspective

In contrast to the pluralistic reconstructivist view held by Patri, there are the individual perceptions of social justice. In line with this view, social justice emerges from the heroic [capital H or small h] efforts of individuals – someone with a vision and a willingness to take risks to see that vision enacted. Whereas Patri supported multiple visions and practices of social justice under one roof, heroic individuals often have a singlemindedness to pursue their own vision tenaciously and apart from others who may not share their particular vision. Such visions, or notions of social justice, begin and end as a discrete, yet coherent belief system which separates nonbelievers from true believers.[5]

American education tends to promote the material conditions for wanting heroic individuals who are able to articulate a prescribed path and rid schools, if not society, of the many frustrations which go along with being a public school system. Educational systems, however, have not been kind to individuals. In educational leadership, an individually-minded principal is often called a maverick; an individually minded teacher-leader is called a trouble-maker. Neither are included under the banner of loyalty to the system. But this is only one obstacle faced by heroic individuals in education. The system itself doesn't lend itself to promoting individual differences: whole classes and whole schools are punished – for the disruptions [and failures] of a few; we staff develop whole faculties; we fund and implement reforms in the aggregate. And as far as our knowledge base and practical skills go, we support "best practices" that are successful, but watch from afar the teacher who has difficulty with classroom management.

What do we know about individualizing classroom teaching that puts one teacher in a room with 40 plus students? Gardner Murphy wrote in Freeing Intelligence Through Teaching (1961), that "The teacher must help the learner to believe his own individuality and his capacity to learn" (p. 47), but "the how" never seems to catch up with the loftiness of this ideal. Do principals know how to motivate their faculty members one at a time? Our system is just not set up for individualized efforts, yet we persist in defining and ascribing successful educational leadership to individualistic perspectives. We steadfastly long for romantic heroes, yet we struggle to educate ourselves and others systemically. Our colleagues in exceptional education teach on the basis of

an individual educational plan (IEP); the medical and legal professions work one-on-one with patients and clients, while educators, social workers, and nurses work with classes, case loads, and floors respectively.

The same individual-system dynamic seems to be true for many of our of most respected educational reforms. There is no separation between the national reformer such as Slavin, Sizer, Levin, Comer, etc, and their reforms, Success For All, Coalition of Essential Schools, Accelerated Schools, The Comer Project. Their reforms are extrapolated from their own scholarly research agendas to form a coherent set of concepts, processes, or even a defined model – to which a certain level of faith and obedience is demanded upfront prior to any demonstration of evidence or positive results. Consensus and unity of purpose are built directly into the implementation processes as a prerequisite for participation – tapping into the insecurity and isolation so pervasive inside of our schools. Thus, an educator may become a disciple of Slavin or Sizer or Levin or Comer, but rarely, if ever, of all or of any combination of reforms which he or she might have constructed on her own or socially. Taking these reforms as conceptions of social justice, they are imposed upon everyone inside the school community. Thus, depending upon which side of the value/vision equation you find yourself, for or against, you are an educational reformer, or otherwise you are not.

Political, Educational and Social Consequences:

In practice, there are two other consequences of the individually constructed meanings of social justice in education. In the "Learning Tree" interviews conducted by Studs Terkel, we meet a group of individual teachers and administrators who have participated in social causes, such as civil rights, the environment, and world peace. These educators are citizens of the world and educators. That is, they know how to integrate the two priorities into their lives and to put each priority first. Clearly, that is not an easy task. In the short quotes below, we hear how educators brought their ideals directly into the classroom and taught subject-matter content through these broader social justice lenses.

> In the interview with Aki Kurose, she tells Terkel that
>
> "When I first began teaching, I had to have lots of knowledge that I could share with my students, so they could memorize all these things. That's not what education is about. We need to teach them that the planet earth is here for us to cherish and share with everybody. We have to stop this possessive approach especially with young children. I realize as they grow up, they may have to compete. But at the low-elementary level, they need to build up their self-esteem and self-worth and, above all, learn to think." (p. 58).

Kurose ended the interview by saying that "Science is exciting. Math is exciting. But it means little unless it is incorporated with peace" (p. 63).

Another educator, Gertie Fox, was also a member of the League of Women's Voters and attended the first United Nations conference on world environment in Stockholm.

> "I paid my way. It was grass roots in origin" (p. 67). "I didn't know what the environmental challenge really was until delegates from the Third World nations, the majority, said: You people from the West are all wrong. It's not earth, air, fire, and water. It's disease, ignorance, and poverty.... It was a revelation to a First Worlder. It's not just earth, air, water -- it's politics" (p.6 7).

These two educators placed themselves inside of social and global issues They participated [Gertie paid her own way to Stockholm!] in struggles and conferences on literacy and the environment as politics. They redefined their subject areas breaking down the closed walls of schools, introducing different cultures, contexts, and social issues. The meaning of their educational lives transcended memorized facts, definitions, methods, content, tests.... These teachers were accountable not just to their students and school systems, but also to the planet. They taught their students about living life morally and how subject matter could be relevant to changing the world.

Not everyone can successfully integrate the world into the closed borders of schools and classrooms. In truth, not everyone wants to find a successful way. Jonathan Kozol for example gave up on the Boston school system after six months of substitute teaching. He did not, however, ever give up on education or children. Kozol's book Savage Inequalities is an example. Others such as Lord Bertram Russell at City College of New York have become test cases in the fight for academic freedom and social justice. As individuals, they fight for social justice from both inside and outside the system. Listen to these words recorded by Studs Terkel (1977) in an interview with Russell.

> Now look here, my dear fellow, have you read any history? Have you heard of the early Christians? Didn't they disobey the law? They were told to worship the Emperor and they didn't. So they suffered. Galileo violated law. He said the earth moved. The law said it didn't. So he was punished. Have you ever heard of anything of value brought into the world without somebody violating a law?...The law represents what people thought right some time ago, because it takes time to enact law. When circumstances change, what was right ceases to be" (p. 67).

Here, the heroic figures transgress the borders, defiantly or not. And as with any radical change effort which challenges those holding power, the consequences do not go unpunished. Thus, social justice emerges through martyrdom, with vindication some time in the future.

The Postmodern Turn

Even as we distinguish among the community builder, the heroic educational reformer, and the unrepentent revolutionary, the different meanings of social justice as socially constructed versus individual commitments can be viewed in modern and postmodern terms. That is, individual commitment is grounded on fulfilling a distinct purpose [e.g., world peace, a clean environment, social justice]. Any efforts made by an individual presupposes that not only can an individual

make a difference, but also that the individual, as part of a larger effort, is working to complete a mission. In modern philosophy, the role of the self, as a rationally thinking and morally just individual, is viewed as the development of the mind towards achieving its highest stage of understanding. Through this process of self-actualization, the world at large may become a better place because the people in it are enlightened selves. Dewey added a social dimension to this progressive process. Thus, instead of identifying a single purpose, mission, or goal for education or for society, Dewey – in practice! – recognized the pragmatic necessity of having multiple, social purposes which permit individuals to work individually as well as collectively towards different notions of social reform and justice.

There is another salient difference between Dewey's social reconstructivists views and those holding individual perspectives. Kurose and Fox were both looking at the future as preferable to what exists in the present. They are asking their students and themselves to help build a better world in the future. Dewey's world is less about the future than it is about the present. Social justice is for today, not for tomorrow. And, thus, for Dewey, the focus is split between the everyday processes of social interactions as well as on the resulting product. In modern/postmodern philosophical terms, Habermas "would like to prove that [his notion of] justice is truth" (Osborne, 1999, p. 57). Through his ideal speech communities and discourse ethics, Habermas attempts to demonstrate the validity of justice and complete the agenda set out by Plato and Kant to achieve certain knowledge. In the postmodern turn, such a program has no merit. Justice exists on its own unique terms regardless of our ability to prove whether it is right, true, valid etc. The intellectual effort that goes into devising such proofs is a waste of time to Foucault. What matters is that we strive for justice through critique, example and practice (p. 57).

Conclusions

We've explored different approaches and meanings to social justice. What then is the role of theory and practice? Is it to prove one approach valid, the other invalid? How will that exercise make either education or the world more just? Each of the practitioner examples cited in this essay, regardless of approach, deserve to be called just. Each of us as educators, however, are free to choose which efforts we want to support, and specifically as academicians, provide arguments for our views in order to further understanding and actions – and to expose those who might expropriate the term "social justice" for unjust actions.[6]

The ongoing leadership challenge is to create social and political spaces for advocates, as well as outlaws, to function inside and out of schools and, deliberately to encourage activists and radical intellectuals to make explicit the connections to their subjective meanings of social justice. While Dewey is criticized for his "largely uncritical treatment of science in the service of social progress and democracy" (Pignatelli, 1993, p. 14), we must demand from our educational visionaries that they do not leave "educational outcomes [which] mirror and safeguard longstanding societal disparities (Fine, pp. 13-19, cited in Pignatelli, p. 15). The postmodern turn brings both educational reform [and the heroic reformers] inside the ongoing critique of the moral use of power. It demands the practitioner and research questions be asked and that faith and obedience

be challenged instead of privileged. After a decade or more of national educational reforms, one would expect that the boundaries separating the discrete programs and models would have been transgressed more than they have to date. Rather than data to justify, where are the deeper understandings [with more questions] on the part of reformers of what has been done and learned? Where are the beginnings again?

While it may be unpostmodern to synthesize, an inclusive view of social justice across the different perspectives should at least be offered here in the name of educational leadership:

(1) There can be no fixed or predictable meanings of social justice prior to actually engaging in social and academic discourses;

(2) The center or unity of any educational reform is so dynamic that it can not hold together for long;

(3) The results of our work [just and unjust] are always fragile and fleeting; and, therefore,

(4) All social justice/educational reform efforts must be deliberately and continuously reinvented and critiqued – again and again.

Educational leadership as practice is caught inside the tensions created by the images and power of having to be perceived by the public as a strong leader – while intellectually and morally recognizing the worth of others, inside and out of schools. As a continuous social construct, educational leadership cannot be one design, one program, or one mind at the exclusion of other designs, programs, and minds. Thus, as we witness the interplay among powerful educational ideas promoted by powerful individuals, in every instance, we must fight to create opportunities [structures and culture] for the emergence of educational leadership from unforeseen and improbable sources – including students. And at every step, articulate how our actions connect to social justice inside and out of schools.

References:

Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J.C. (1977/1996). Reproduction in Education, Society & Culture. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dewey, J. (1909). Moral principles in education. H. Suzzallo (Ed.). Riverside Educational Monographs. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company

Dewey, J. (1904). "The relation of theory to practice in the education." In The Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part I. (Pp. 9-30). Chicago: University of Chicago

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and Promises. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books

Halpin, A. (1966). Theory and Research in Administration New York: MacMIllan Co.

Kleinman, J. (1993). "P.S. 500 (Speyer School): An early experiment in urban alternative education In F. Pignatelli and S. Pflaum (Eds.). Celebrating diverse voices: Progressive education and equity. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.

McMurry, F. et al. (1904). "Theory and practice at Teachers College, Columbia University. In The Third Yearbook of the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, Part I. (Pp. 43-64). Chicago: University of Chicago

Murphy, G. (1961). Freeing Intelligence through Teaching. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Patri, A. (1917). A Schoolmaster of the Great City. New York: MacMillan Co.

Pignatelli, F. (1993). "Toward a postprogressive theory of education." Educational Foundations, 7(3), 7-26.

Stevens, Jr. E. (1972). Social centers, politics, and social efficiency in the Progressive Era. History of Education Quarterly, pp. 17-33.

Terkel, S. (1995). "The learning tree," Coming of Age (p. 43-70). New York: The New Press

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the annual conference of UCEA in Albuquerque, NM with the more flippant title "Personal and weighty remarks [of others] on Theory, Practice and Social Justice." In this version, I have not only changed the title to direct attention toward educational leadership, but also have rethought the discussion of individual conceptions of social justice.

2. Perhaps a more accurate statement might be that the topic of social justice has only recently emerged within the Division A/UCEA community of educational leadership scholars. William Foster's 1986 book, Paradigms and Promises (Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books) clearly called for such an agenda (pp.23-33). In 1992, Joseph Murphy made the connection between school improvement and social justice in "Restructuring schooling: The equity infrastructure. Occasional Paper No. 14" Harvard Graduate School of Education, the National Center for Educational Leadership (ERIC Documentation No. 350690). And, an ERIC search of more recent articles [1995-present] linking social justice to educational leadership yielded another nine papers. There is a history.

3.Who was Dr. McMurry? From the little investigations I've done, there seems to be two Frank McMurrys [as opposed to Charles and Frank McMurry, brothers who were both prominent

professors]. From Raymond Callahan, we get a completely different view of the man. On page 119, in Education and the Cult of Efficiency, Callahan tells of a situation in New York City "where the Board of Estimates hired experts, Professors Hanus of Harvard and McMurry of Teachers College, among others, to investigate the schools. The findings, published in several volumes, were critical and many New York schoolman, including Superintendent William Maxwell, thought unjustly so. Maxwell accused McMurry of making sweeping conclusions based on inadequate evidence, and other educational leaders in New York described the survey as "setting third rate men at the task of inspecting and estimated what first rate men were doing." ("good and bad in New York Schools, " Educational Review XLVII (January, 1914, 67-68). In a series of studies [see "The contexts of partial truths" Journal of Educational Administration] I did on Margaret Court [pseudonym], I struggled with the moral, amoral, and immoral sides of her leadership. The point is that perspective and context make a difference in how we describe policies, programs, and people. As researchers, when you we consider our judgments to be final?

4. In researching the Speyer School, I stumbled upon another set of contradictory facts. Based on Hollingworth (1936), Joseph Kleinman (1993) stated that the Speyer School was not founded until 1935 as a combined effort with the NYC Board of Education and Teachers College, Columbia University. Then drawing on Featherstone (1938), Kleinman wrote that the school was: "Designed specifically to be an experimental school for an identified five year period, the Speyer School, located in Harlem, drew students from around the city as well as from the largely workin-class homes and families on home relief who lived in the neighborhood. Its goal was to serve two distinct populations –gifted and slow learners – who were not doing well in traditional settings" (p. 157). Historically, were there two Speyer Schools? The only overlap I could see between McMurry's account and that of Kleinman were the control of Teachers College and the reference to teachers serving as social workers, "making home visits and helping families obtain aid from social agencies" (p.169). If you are interested in this history, look it up.

5. Although Eric Hoffer claims that his book The True Believer "passes no judgment, and expresses no preferences" (p. xi), he is not kind to leaders and followers of mass movements. According to Hoffer (1951), the most decisive qualities of an effective leader [of true believers] "seem to be audacity, fanatical faith in a holy cause, an awareness of the importance of a close-knit collectivity, and, above all, the ability to evoke fervent devotion in a group of able lieutenants" (p. 106). He goes on to say that "the quality of ideas seems to play a minor role in mass movement leadership. What counts is the arrogant gesture.... [T] here can be no mass movement without some deliberate misrepresentation of facts" (p. 107). One final observation he makes is that "Men of thought seldom work well together, whereas between men of action there is usually an easy camaraderie. Team work is rare in intellectual or artistic undertakings, but common and almost indispensable among men of action" (p. 111-112). As for the followers, Hoffer concludes that "the frustrated are also likely to be the most steadfast followers... the least self-reliant" (p. 109). Whatever parallels the reader wishes to draw from Hoffer to public education and to educational reform models, I'm sure will be based on personal lived experiences.

6. A new charter school in Broward County, FL, Toussaint L'Ouverture Arts for Social Justice High School contains the words "social justice" in its title; yet, in the words of its new director, "We're not going to be a dumping ground for kids at risk." What does social justice mean here? "Charter school plan focuses on social justice through arts" by Lona O'Connor, Sun-Sentinel. [lo'connor@sun-sentinel.com]